BEFORE THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY BOARD OF PUBLIC UTILITIES OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW

)
) BPU Docket No. WR03030222
) OAL Docket No. PUCRS 02351-03S
)

DIRECT TESTIMONY AND EXHIBITS OF BRIAN KALCIC ON BEHALF OF THE NEW JERSEY DIVISION OF THE RATEPAYER ADVOCATE

SEEMA M. SINGH, ESQ. Ratepayer Advocate

Division of the Ratepayer Advocate 31 Clinton Street, 11th Floor P. O. Box 46005 Newark, New Jersey 07101 (973) 648-2690 - Phone (973) 624-1047 - Fax www.rpa.state.nj.us njratepayer@rpa.state.nj.us

Filed: January 9, 2004

1	Q.	Please state your name and business address.
2	A.	Brian Kalcic, 225 S. Meramec Avenue, Suite 720, St. Louis, Missouri 63105.
3		
4	Q.	What is your occupation?
5	A.	I am an economist and consultant in the field of public utility regulation, and principal of
6		Excel Consulting. My qualifications are described in the Appendix to this testimony.
7		
8	Q.	On whose behalf are you testifying in this case?
9	A.	I am testifying on behalf of the New Jersey Division of the Ratepayer Advocate
10		("Ratepayer Advocate").
11		
12	Q.	What is the subject of your testimony?
13	A.	I have been asked by the Ratepayer Advocate to review the rate structure proposals filed
14		by Applied Wastewater Management, Inc. ("AWMI" or "Company") and to derive an
15		appropriate rate design that reflects the Ratepayer Advocate's recommended revenue
16		requirement in this proceeding.
17		
18	Q.	Please summarize your recommendations.
19	A.	Based upon my review of the Company's petition and existing rate structure, I
20		recommend that Your Honor and the New Jersey Board of Public Utilities ("Board" or
21		"BPU") order AWMI:

- to implement the Ratepayer Advocate's recommended revenue distribution
 providing for an overall decrease in total revenues of 3.23%;
 - to incorporate the Ratepayer Advocate's recommended rate design which reflects a decrease in the Company's statewide fixed wastewater charge; and
 - to submit a detailed study of the feasibility of moving to a two-part residential wastewater tariff in its next rate proceeding.

AWMI Rate Structure / Rate Design

A.

Q. Mr. Kalcic, please describe AWMI's present rate structure.

The Company currently provides wastewater service to approximately 2,900 residential and 3 non-residential customers. Residential customers are served via 2 separate rate schedules which cover: 1) the Community On-Site Water and/or Wastewater System ("COWS") rate area; and 2) the Homestead rate area. Residential customers served via the COWS rate schedule currently pay a flat annual rate of \$904 for wastewater service. Homestead customers are currently charged a flat annual rate of \$442.60. The Company's non-residential customers are served via a separate two-part rate schedule (i.e., one containing a fixed charge and a consumption charge) and currently pay an average of \$1,167 per year for wastewater service.

In addition, AWMI provides water service to approximately 300 General

Metered Service customers and fire protection service to 8 private and 24 public fire

1		protection customers. Each of the above services are provided via separate, consolidated
2		rate schedules.
3		
4	Q.	Did the Company perform a cost-of-service study for this proceeding?
5	A.	No, it did not.
6		
7	Q.	How then does AWMI propose to recover its requested revenue increase in this
8		proceeding?
9	A.	The Company proposed revenue distribution is shown in Schedule BK-1. Overall,
10		AWMI is proposing to increase its Homestead wastewater charge approximately 94% in
11		order to move the rate towards parity with its COWS wastewater charge. All other rate
12		schedules would receive an across-the-board residual increase of approximately 31%
13		under the Company's proposal.
14		
15	Q.	Do you agree that the Company's COWS and Homestead wastewater charges
16		should be moved toward parity in this proceeding?
17	A.	Yes, I do.
18		
19		
20		
21		

1	Q.	Mr. Kalcic, what is your recommendation with respect to the apportionment of
2		the Ratepayer Advocate's recommended revenue adjustment in this proceeding?
3	A.	I recommend that individual rate class revenue levels be adjusted as shown in Schedule
4		BK-2.
5		
6	Q.	Please discuss how you arrived your recommended revenue distribution.
7	A.	Mr. Henkes is recommending an overall revenue decrease of \$73,536 or 3.23%. Given
8		the size of the Ratepayer Advocate's recommended decrease and the absence of a class
9		cost-of-service study, I recommend assigning the entire decrease of \$73,536 to the
10		Company's COWS wastewater division. Such an approach would result in a COWS
11		division decrease of 4.42% as shown in line 1 of Schedule BK-2.
12		
13	Q.	Have you developed rates to implement your recommended revenue distribution?
14	A.	Yes. Schedule BK-3 shows my recommended rate design and proof of revenue. As
15		shown on Schedule BK-3, line 1, page 1 of 2, my recommended COWS wastewater
16		charge is \$864.06 per year. All other rates are unchanged in Schedule BK-3.
17		
18	Q.	Has the Company proposed any increase in its Miscellaneous Service charges
19		contained in Rate Schedule No. 7?
20	A.	No. Likewise, I recommend that all such charges remain unchanged.

1	Q.	Mr. Kalcic, do you have any other comments regarding the Company's presen

2 wastewater rate structure?

A. Yes, I do. As shown on page 1 of Schedule BK-3, the Company currently maintains a two-part rate schedule for its non-residential wastewater customers. However, residential wastewater customers are served from a one-part rate schedule – one consisting of a flat annual fee without a separate charge related to water usage. As a result, all residential customers within a given rate area pay an identical annual wastewater charge, regardless of water usage.

Q. Is this type of outcome appropriate?

A. No. The above outcome produces inequities within the residential class. Specifically, since one may expect the total amount of a household's monthly effluent to be positively correlated with its water usage, larger than average residential water users are subsidized by smaller than average users under the Company's current one-part rate.

A two-part residential wastewater tariff could begin to address this inequity by making a household's total annual wastewater bill a function of its total water usage.

Q. What do you recommend?

A. I recommend that the Board order the Company to submit a detailed study of the feasibility of moving to a two-part residential wastewater tariff in its next rate proceeding.At a minimum, the study should include an analysis of: 1) all costs (i.e., both one-time and

ongoing) associated with developing and maintaining such a billing structure; and 2) the appropriate split of the residential wastewater revenue requirement between a fixed charge and consumption charge. In addition, AWMI should provide a detailed estimate of the timetable necessary to implement a two-part tariff, should the Board decide to adopt this type of residential rate at the conclusion of the Company's next base rate proceeding.

- 8 Q. Does this conclude your direct testimony?
- 9 A. Yes.

Company Proposed Distribution of its Requested Adjustment in Total Revenue (<u>Test Period Ending June 30, 2003</u>)

Line <u>No.</u>	Actual 12 Months Ender Description 06/30/02		Company <u>Adjustments</u>	Company Pro Forma <u>Revenue</u>	Proposed <u>Increase</u>	Company Proposed <u>Revenue</u>	Percent Increase
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
1	Sewer - COWS	\$ 1,362,735	\$ 301,529	\$ 1,664,264	\$ 508,483	\$ 2,172,747	30.55%
2	Sewer - Homestead	0	476,641	476,641	445,134	921,775	93.39%
3	GMS Water	142,014	(40,098)	101,916	31,231	133,147	30.64%
4	Private Fire Protection	(159)	1,759	\$1,600	490	2,090	30.63%
5	Public Fire Protection	2,575	2,225	4,800	1,470	6,270	30.63%
6	Other Operating Revenues	-	-	-	-	-	
7	Rounding	-		-	\$ 982	\$ 982	
8	Total Operating Revenues	\$ 1,507,165	\$ 742,056	\$ 2,249,221	\$ 987,790	\$ 3,237,011	43.92%
	Source:	Exhibit P-2	Exhibit P-2	(1) + (2)	Exhibit P-2	(3) + (4)	
	G54166.	Schedule 5	Schedule 5	· / · (-/	Schedule 5 and RAR-RD-1	(=, - (-)	

Ratepayer Advocate Recommended Distribution of its Recommended Adjustment in Total Revenue (Test Period Ending June 30, 2003)

Line <u>No.</u>	<u>Description</u>		Company Pro Forma Revenue (1)	Recommended Adjustments (2)		commended Pro Forma Revenue (3)	ommended ncrease (4)	Re	ecommended Final <u>Revenue</u> (5)	Percent Increase (6)
1	Sewer - COWS	\$	1,664,264	\$ -	\$	1,664,264	\$ (73,530)	\$	1,590,734	-4.42%
2	Sewer - Homestead		476,641	0		476,641	0		476,641	0.00%
3	GMS Water		101,916	25,466		127,382	0		127,382	0.00%
4	Private Fire Protection		1,600	0		\$1,600	0		1,600	0.00%
5	Public Fire Protection		4,800	0		\$4,800	0		4,800	0.00%
6	Other Operating Revenues		-	-		-	-		-	
7	Rounding		<u>-</u>	 _		-	\$ (6)	\$	(6)	
8	Total Operating Revenues	<u>\$</u>	2,249,221	\$ 25,466	\$	2,274,687	\$ (73,536)	<u>\$</u>	2,201,151	-3.23%

Source: Exhibit P-2 Sch. RJH-6 (1) + (2) (5) - (4) Sch. BK-3 Schedule 5 Column 3

Ratepayer Advocate Recommended Rates and Proof of Revenue (<u>Test Period Ending June 30, 2003</u>)

			Test	Test								
Line		Meter	Period	Period	Pre	sent	Recoi		mmended			
No.		Size	Customers	Bills	Rate	Revenue		Rate		Revenue	% Increase	
	Sewer Service										_	
	Residential											
1	All Statewide		1,841	1,841	\$ 904.00	\$1,664,264	\$	864.06	\$	1,590,734	-4.42%	
2	Homestead		1,058	1,058	\$ 442.60	\$468,271	\$	442.60		\$468,271	0.00%	
3	Country Walk		11	11	\$ 442.60	<u>\$4,869</u>	\$	442.60		<u>\$4,869</u>	0.00%	
4	Subt Residential					\$2,137,404				\$2,063,874	-3.44%	
	Non-Residential											
	Fixed											
5		5/8	-	-	\$ 44.26	\$0	\$	44.26		\$0	0.00%	
6		3/4	3	12	\$ 66.39	\$797	\$	66.39		\$797	0.00%	
7		1	-	-	\$ 110.65	\$0	\$	110.65		\$0	0.00%	
8		1 1/2	-	-	\$ 221.30	\$0	\$	221.30		\$0	0.00%	
9		2	-	-	\$ 354.08	\$0	\$	354.08		\$0	0.00%	
	Consumption											
10	Per 1,000 gal.			561	\$ 4.8200	<u>\$2,704</u>	\$	4.8200		<u>\$2,704</u>	0.00%	
	Subt Non-Resider	ntial			_	\$3,501	_			\$3,501	0.00%	

Ratepayer Advocate Recommended Rates and Proof of Revenue (<u>Test Period Ending June 30, 2003</u>)

			Test	Test						
Line		Meter	Period	Period	Pre	esent		Recon		
<u>No.</u>		Size	Customers	Bills	Rate	Revenue		Rate	Revenue	% Increase
	Water Service									
	Fixed									
1		5/8	299	1,196	\$ 25.00	\$29,900	\$	25.00	\$29,900	0.00%
2		3/4	-	-	\$ 35.50	\$0	\$	35.50	\$0	0.00%
3		1	-	-	\$ 43.48	\$0	\$	43.48	\$0	0.00%
4		1 1/2	-	-	\$ 75.00	\$0	\$	75.00	\$0	0.00%
5		2	4	16	\$ 200.00	\$3,200	\$	200.00	\$3,200	0.00%
	Consumption									
6	Per 1,000 gal.			26,618	\$ 3.5420	<u>\$94,282</u>	\$	3.5420	\$94,282	0.00%
7	Subt Water					\$127,382			\$127,382	0.00%
8	Private Fire Prote Four Seasons	<u>ction</u>	8	32	\$ 50.00	\$1,600	\$	50.00	\$1,600	0.00%
9	Public Fire Protect Country Oaks	<u>ction</u>	24	96	\$ 50.00	<u>\$4,800</u>	\$	50.00	<u>\$4,800</u>	0.00%
10	Subt Fire					\$6,400			\$6,400	0.00%
11	Other Revenues					\$0	Ē		\$0	0.00%

11 Subt Sewer Revenues \$2,140,905 \$2,067,375 -3.43%

APPENDIX

Qualifications of Brian Kalcic

Mr. Kalcic graduated from Illinois Benedictine College with a Bachelor of Arts degree in Economics in December, 1974. In May, 1977 he received a Master of Arts degree in Economics from Washington University, St. Louis. In addition, he has completed all course requirements at Washington University for a Ph.D. in Economics.

From 1977 to 1982, Mr. Kalcic taught courses in economics at both Washington University and Webster University. The courses that he taught included Microeconomic and Macroeconomic Theory, Labor Economics and Public Finance.

During 1980 and 1981, Mr. Kalcic was a consultant to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, St. Louis District Office. His responsibilities included data collection and organization, statistical analysis and trial testimony.

From 1982 to 1996, Mr. Kalcic was employed by the firm of Cook, Eisdorfer & Associates, Inc.. During that time, he participated in the analysis of electric, gas and water utility rate case filings. His primary responsibilities included cost-of-service and economic analysis, model building, and statistical analysis.

In 1996, Mr. Kalcic founded Excel Consulting, a consulting practice which provides business and regulatory analysis.

Mr. Kalcic has previously testified before the state regulatory commissions of Delaware, Kentucky, Maine, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Missouri, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Texas, and the Bonneville Power Administration.